

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18, 20, 21, 23, 29, 32-59 have been canceled.

Claims 19, 22, 24 have been amended to independent form, including all parent claim limitations including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, in accordance with the Examiner's indication that claims 19, 22, 24-28, 30, 31 would be allowable if so amended. This indication of allowability is noted with appreciation.

New claim 60 defines a combination including the engine (122, Fig. 13), the first transmission (126), and the second transmission (128). Claim 60 requires that the second transmission (128) be above the first transmission (126) and horizontally adjacent the engine (122). Claim 60 requires that the output (132, Fig. 14) of the second transmission (128) be a horizontal shaft aft of the defined vertical input shaft (130) of the second transmission (128). In contrast, in Musgrave U.S. Patent 2,891,370, the output shaft 127 of second transmission 93 is not aft of the vertical input shaft 91. Consideration and allowance of the combination defined in claim 60 is respectfully requested.

Claim 61 depends from claim 60 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 61 requires that the horizontal shaft (132) of the output of the second transmission (128) extend aft of the vertical input shaft (130) of the second transmission (128) and parallel to the defined forward direction of vehicle propulsion. In contrast, in Musgrave '370, output shaft 127 of second transmission 93 extends transversely to the noted direction of vehicle propulsion, not parallel thereto as required by claim 61. Consideration and allowance of claim 61 is respectfully requested.

Claim 62 requires that each of the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) be mounted to the first transmission (126) at an upper surface (134) thereof independently of the vehicle frame (112, 114) such that the PTO shaft (124) of the

engine (122) and the input shaft (130) of the second transmission (128) extend vertically and in parallel above the first transmission (126) independently of the vehicle frame (112, 114) and accordingly independently of torsional twisting of the vehicle frame (112, 114) under load otherwise causing misalignment and non-parallelism of the vertical PTO shaft (124) of the engine (122) and the vertical input shaft (130) of the second transmission (128). This is in direct contradistinction to Musgrave '370 wherein the engine and the second transmission are mounted to the frame and hence are subject to torsional twisting of the vehicle frame under load, and thus subject to misalignment and non-parallelism of the noted shafts. This is confirmed by the use of idler pulleys in Musgrave '370 which are typically used to guide the belt to compensate for pulleys that are out of alignment. Consideration and allowance of claim 62 is respectfully requested.

Claim 63 defines a combination including the noted engine (122), first transmission (126), and second transmission (128). Claim 63 requires that the first transmission (126) be mounted to the vehicle frame (112, 114) by shock and vibration absorbing pads (116), and that the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) be mounted to the first transmission (126) independently of the vehicle frame (112, 114). In contrast, in Musgrave '370, engine 31 and second transmission 93 are not mounted to the first transmission independently of the vehicle frame. To the contrary, engine 31 and second transmission 93 are mounted to the vehicle frame. Furthermore, claim 63 requires a modular pre-assembled unit ready for drop-in mounting to the vehicle. This is not taught nor feasible in Musgrave '370 because engine 31 and second transmission 93 are mounted to the frame, not to the second transmission. Consideration and allowance of claim 63 is respectfully requested.

Claim 64 depends from claim 63 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 64 requires that the first transmission (126) with the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) mounted thereto comprise the defined modular pre-assembled unit for drop-in mounting to the vehicle.

Claim 65 depends from claim 63 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 65 defines a subcombination including a power transfer device (136, Fig. 13) driven by the second transmission (128) to transfer power to propel the vehicle, and requires that the first transmission (126) be a constant velocity clutch continuously variable transmission, CVT, having the defined pulleys and belt, and requires that the second transmission (128) be a 90° gear transmission, and requires a CVT mounting case (148) housing the defined first and second pulleys (142 and 144), and requires that the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) are each mounted to the CVT mounting case (148) at respective first and second mounting attachments (150 and 152) precisely spaced and aligned to provide precise spacing of the centerlines of the PTO shaft (124) and the input shaft (130) of the second transmission (128) and precise alignment of such shafts in parallelism, and requires a transfer case (214) housing the defined power transfer rotary drive member (196) and mounted to at least one of the second transmission (128) and the CVT mounting case (148). It is respectfully submitted that this combination is not shown nor suggested in the references.

Claim 66 defines a method for installing drivetrain components, and requires mounting the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) to the first transmission (126) as a self-contained pre-assembled modular unit, and mounting the first transmission (126) on shock and vibration absorbing pads (116) to the vehicle frame (112, 114) such that the first transmission (126) is isolated from the vehicle frame (112, 114) by the shock and vibration absorbing pads (116), and such that the engine (122) and the second transmission (128) are isolated from the vehicle frame (112, 114) by the first transmission (126) and the shock and vibration absorbing pads (116). In contrast, in Musgrave '370, engine 31 and second transmission 93 are mounted to the vehicle frame and do not satisfy the requirements of claim 66. It is respectfully submitted that the combination defined in claim 66 is not reasonably taught in the art. Consideration and allowance of claim 66 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 09/981,246
Amendment dated February 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 24, 2003

Claim 67 depends from claim 66 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Claim 67 defines a subcombination which is believed allowable.

Claim 68 depends from claim 66 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Claim 68 defines a subcombination which is believed allowable.

This Application should now be condition for allowance with claims 19, 22, 24-28, 30, 31, 60-68, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP



Michael E. Taken
(Reg. No. 28,120)

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 271-7590